

Trade Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a filing deadline and to provide certain safeguards to ensure that the interests of investors are well protected under the implied private action provisions of the act.

S. 388

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties for noncompliance by States with a program requiring the use of motorcycle helmets, and for other purposes.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] were added as cosponsors of S. 391, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to undertake activities to halt and reverse the decline in forest health on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 92—AMENDING RULE XXV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 92

*Resolved*, That Rule XXV, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended as follows:

Strike the figure after "Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry" and insert in lieu thereof "18".

Strike the figure after "Energy and Natural Resources" and insert in lieu thereof "20".

SEC. 2. That Rule XXV, paragraph 3(c) of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended as follows:

Strike the figure after "Indian Affairs" and insert in lieu thereof "16".

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 93—MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS TO SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 93

*Resolved*, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following Senate committees for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Craig, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Grams, Mr. Jeffords, and Mr. Burns.

Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Simpson (Chairman), Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Specter, Mr.

Thurmond, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Craig.

Indian Affairs: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Domenici, Mrs. Kassebaum, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Hatch.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 94—MAKING A MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENT

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 94

*Resolved*, That the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Campbell) is hereby appointed to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, and that the following be the majority membership on that committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry: Mr. Lugar (Chairman), Mr. Dole, Mr. Helms, Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Craig, Mr. Coverdell, Mr. Santorum, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Campbell.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Friday, March 24, 1995, at 9 a.m., in Senate Dirksen Room 226, on "The 10th Amendment and the Conference of the States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### THE LINE-ITEM VETO

• Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it was with the greatest of enthusiasm that I chose to support the line-item veto legislation.

In just a few weeks, all of us will be asked to cast our votes to raise the debt ceiling for this country to more than \$5 trillion. It is difficult to comprehend the enormity of this figure. If you took those 5 trillion individual dollars and laid them end to end, they would span the vast icy distance between the Earth and Moon almost 2,000 times.

The line-item veto represents a small but most significant first step toward processes to ensure greater fiscal responsibility. I believe the measure that we recently passed is the best workable compromise between various approaches and will make this legislation very effective. I am particularly pleased by the inclusion of a "lockbox" provision to ensure that any spending that is "zeroed out" is earmarked for deficit reduction.

Our past experience with spending patterns here in Congress demonstrates why it was crucial to include this pro-

vision. I have seen a number of programs terminated on the Senate floor, after hours of spirited debate centered around the question—"can we afford it"? After concluding that we could not afford the program in question, we terminated the program, then failed to adjust the spending caps downward, meaning that we simply spent the money on something else. Such a "loophole" in this legislation would be a costly and destructive provision that would make a mockery of this measure. Without the lockbox provision the President could terminate a program with an eye toward seeing those funds reprogrammed in another direction. Or, Congress could simply retitle or reallocate the funding items which failed to pass muster. That would subvert the clear intention of this sharpened tool, which is to enable the President to assist in slowing down and reducing Government spending.

What pleases me the most about this legislation is that its modified form will permit the President to confront the problem of rising entitlement spending. This is, as we well know, the fastest growing category of Federal spending, and the single greatest cause of runaway debt. In the past, one over-used tactic used to evade the discipline of discretionary spending caps has been to promote new programs in the form of mandatory entitlements. This designation has shielded them from annual scrutiny through the appropriations process and creates an ever expanding "black hole" into which our Federal dollars disappear. Giving the President a chance to ward off future trespasses in area will make this legislation much more effective in controlling spending.

Opponents of this measure have criticized the line-item veto on the basis of or experience with it at the State level. Sometimes they say that such authority is not easily applied at the Federal level, or worse yet, that it does not even work in the States. The latter contention is simply flat-out wrong. The line-item veto does work effectively at the State level. We heard testimony to that effect in the Judiciary Committee, where we learned of countless instances in which governors have used the power to eliminate wasteful spending from appropriations bills. It is one reason why no State has a fiscal crisis on the order of compare to our Federal deficit.

I fully understand the sincerity of opponents of this measure when they voice fears that the line-item veto would give too much power to the President. The allegation has been made that the President could use this power to punish individual legislators, indeed to carry out a personal vendetta against a particular Congressman or Senator. I simply believe that due reflection on this matter will show that there is little to fear from such a situation occurring. First of all, these vetoes will not be made in secret. The press will eagerly report on the items

rescinded, and they will be evaluated in their own right, quite apart from any personal issues surrounding them. Regardless of the President's personal feelings about any legislator, the final test of the issue will be whether or not the spending is appropriate. Both the President and the Congress will have to make the appropriate case as to whether or not the spending should occur.

I was extremely pleased when Bill Clinton, as a candidate for the Presidency, indicated his support for a line-item veto. We on our side of the aisle, have delivered such an option to him. It is a good time to do it—with a Republican Congress and Democratic President. It is a clear indication that this should not be a partisan issue. It should be an issue around which fiscally responsible legislators on both sides can rally.

Many of my colleagues are already very familiar with a process that I have seen too often in my 16 years of Senate service. We send a popular bill down to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue only after we have loaded it up with a pile of pet pork projects, knowing full well that the President has to swallow everything in order to get the provisions that are so desired by him. There might be clearly wasteful spending in that package, but the President must nonetheless feel compelled to sign the bill simply because it is the only way to preserve "essential" spending or other legislative language.

This problem is compounded when the President is sent the appropriations bills at the 11th hour of the congressional session. The President must sign those, or else risk a temporary shutdown of vital Government functions.

The veto in its current form is a terribly crude blunt instrument, and it does not enable the President to deal effectively with these situations. Passage of the line-item veto will finely make it a more precise and agile tool, one which can be surgically wielded effectively on behalf of the U.S. taxpayer.●

#### CUBA: TIME TO CHANGE DIRECTION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, my colleagues in the Senate know that I think that the policy of the United States toward Cuba does not make any sense at all.

I have introduced a bill which would permit Americans to travel to Cuba. To deny travel to any place, other than for security reasons, is an infringement of basic free speech.

We have to be able to learn as much as we can everywhere. To restrict travel is to restrict the thought and learning process.

The New York Times recently had an editorial titled "Cuba: Time to Change Direction."

It points out the ridiculousness of our present Cuban policy.

I ask that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1995]

#### CUBA: TIME TO CHANGE DIRECTION

The sight of Fidel Castro in a business suit being escorted about Paris this week as an honored guest deserves some consideration in Washington. With the Soviet Union gone and the cold war over, the only threat that the Cuban Communist poses to the United States lies in the imagination of ideological warriors like Senator Jesse Helms. While the time has not yet come to welcome Mr. Castro to Washington, a re-examination of Cuba policy is long overdue. The embargo of Cuba, begun when John Kennedy occupied the White House and Nikita Khrushchev was Soviet leader, has outlived its usefulness.

Conservatives still cling to the notion that isolating Cuba and creating misery for its people will eventually cause an uprising and sweep Mr. Castro from power. Now that he is without Soviet support and his economy is in tatters, they reason, sanctions should be tightened.

This scenario is unwise and inhumane. Cuba will survive because other nations are investing there and are not participating in the embargo. Last year when a resolution against the embargo came up at the U.N., it passed by 101 votes to 2. The kind of outright rebellion envisioned by Senator Helms and some Cuban-Americans, if it did occur, would bring bloodshed and more misery for many Cubans. At a time when Washington is trying hard to encourage peaceful transitions elsewhere in the region and world, it makes little sense to encourage bloodshed in Cuba.

An increasing number of younger, more moderate Cuban-Americans are fed up with the revenge fantasies of their elders, and would like to see more dialogue and commerce with Mr. Castro's regime. They feel that his repressive policies could not continue for long if the barriers were lifted and ordinary Cubans could have a taste of material success and a whiff of personal freedom from the north. Washington's anachronistic policy may even help Mr. Castro, by giving him a convenient scapegoat for all his failure at home.

Without the embargo, the excuses would be gone. Open communication with the United States, freedom for Cuban-Americans to invest in businesses back home, and access to North American goods could be first steps. More favorable trade conditions could be held out as incentives to further reforms. Mr. Castro's Paris visit illustrated the power of the friendly gesture. After his warm reception by President Mitterrand, Mr. Castro agreed to allow a French human rights group to visit.

There should be gradations in American policy toward repressive governments. When American national security is potentially threatened, as with Iran and its efforts to develop nuclear weapons, Washington is justified in banning commerce. In cases like China and Cuba, where internal policies are anathema to Americans but American security is not at risk, commerce can be encouraged but trade privileges should be withheld.

Scuttling the embargo would take some political courage. All the White House had to do last week to inspire Mr. Helms's wrath was to hint that it might consider lifting some additional sanctions imposed last year during the immigration crisis. But the political clout of the Cuban exile community has diminished in recent years as more Cuban-Americans have abandoned the traditional confrontational stance.

Long gone are the days when Soviet troops and bases in Cuba represented a real threat to the United States and Mr. Castro was exporting arms and revolution in the hemi-

sphere. Cuba, absent the ghosts of the cold war, is an impoverished neighbor of the United States led by a dictator overtaken by history. American policy should reflect that reality rather than a world that no longer exists.●

#### NICKLES-REID SUBSTITUTE TO S. 219

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, upon the consideration of S. 219, the Regulatory Transition Act, I will offer along with my colleagues Senator HARRY REID, Senator KIT BOND, and Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON an amendment which provides for a 45-day congressional review of Federal regulations. During that time, Congress will be authorized to review and, potentially, reject regulations before they become final. This alternative provide an opportunity to move forward on the critical issue of regulatory reform in a bipartisan manner.

I ask that following my statement the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The proposed amendment follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Transition Act of 1995".

#### SEC. 2. FINDING.

The Congress finds that effective steps for improving the efficiency and proper management of Government operations will be promoted if a moratorium on the effectiveness of certain significant final rules is imposed in order to provide Congress an opportunity for review.

#### SEC. 3. MORATORIUM ON REGULATIONS; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

(a) REPORTING AND REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) REPORTING TO CONGRESS.—

(A) Before a rule can take effect as a final rule, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress a report containing—

(i) a copy of the rule;

(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(iii) the proposed effective date of the rule; and

(iv) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any.

(B) Upon receipt, each House shall provide copies to the Chairman and Ranking Member of each committee with jurisdiction.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF SIGNIFICANT RULES.—A significant rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect as a final rule, the latest of—

(A) the later of the date occurring 45 days after the date on which—

(i) the Congress receives the report submitted under paragraph (1); or

(ii) the rule is published in the Federal Register;

(B) if the Congress passes a joint resolution of disapproval described under section 4 relating to the rule, and the President signs a veto of such resolution, the earlier date—

(i) on which either House of Congress votes and fails to override the veto of the President; or

(ii) occurring 30 session days after the date on which the Congress received the veto and objections of the President; or